REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended in order to more accurately claim the subject matter disclosed in the present application.

35 USC 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *St. George et al.*, [U.S. Patent No. 3,643,020]. More specifically, the Examiner has stated that *St. George et al.* teach an automated kiosk comprising an inherent cabinet, a face frame releasably securable to the cabinet, a plurality of cross members, at least one of the cross members secured to the face frame, at least one of the cross members releasably securable in a plurality of cross member configurations in relation to the face frame, and a plurality of hardware components releasably securable to the cross members, wherein the configurations allow for a plurality of hardware component configurations by allowing components of various shapes or sizes to be secured to the cross members. Applicant has amended claim 1 so as to further define various features recited in the claim. More specifically, claim 1 now recites--(b) a face frame releasably securable to said cabinet, said face frame defining an interface area--, and further defines the cross member configurations in paragraph (c) as --...dividing said interface area into a plurality of sub-areas--. As well, claim 1 now recites --wherein said plurality of cross member configurations define various combinations of sub-areas within said interface area for receiving various combinations of hardware components of various shapes and sizes--. It is respectfully submitted that *St. George* does not disclose the combination of features now recited in amended claim 1 since merely unsecuring and re-securing the support members (21) at a different position along the frame or interchanging diagonal members does not result in an interface area being divided into various combinations of sub-areas for receiving various combinations of hardware components of various shapes and sizes. In light of the above, Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by *St. George*. Furthermore, Applicant

submits that claims 2, 4-6 and 28 are also not anticipated by *St. George* by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-6, 8, 21, 22 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kojima*, [U.S. Patent No. 5,363,150]. In the objection, the Examiner states that *Kojima* teaches an automated kiosk comprising a cabinet, a face frame releasably securable to the cabinet, a plurality of cross members with at least one of the cross members secured to the face frame, at least one of the cross members releasably securable in a plurality of cross member configurations in relation to the face frame, and a plurality of hardware components releasably secured to the cross members (via members 5), wherein the configurations allow for a plurality of hardware component configurations by allowing components of various sizes or shapes to be secured to the cross members. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's objection since, as discussed above, claim 1 now recites that the face frame of Applicant's kiosk defines an interface area, and that the plurality of cross member configurations define various combinations of sub-areas within the interface area. This feature of Applicant's kiosk is not disclosed by *Kojima* since *Kojima* relates mainly to a casing for use with a television set where only one opening is created for receiving the television screen. Therefore, *Kojima* does not disclose the creation of different sub-areas within an interface area defined by the main face frame. While the Examiner alleges that *Kojima* discloses a "plurality of cross member configurations" since opposite and similar members can be unsecured and re-secured in the opposite position along the frame and that corner members can be interchanged thereby fulfilling the "releasably secured" and "plurality of cross member configurations" requirements, it is respectfully submitted that simply interchanging similar components does not result in the creation of different sub-areas within a main interface area. Therefore, since *Kojima* does not disclose all of features of the automated kiosk as claimed in amended claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are not anticipated

thereby. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 2, 4-8, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Lewis et al.*, [U.S. Patent No. 6,082,616]. In the objection, the Examiner states that *Lewis et al.* teach an "automated kiosk" comprising a cabinet, a face frame releasably securable to the cabinet, a plurality of cross members, at least one of the cross members being secured to the face frame, at least one of the cross members releasably securable in a plurality of cross member configurations in relation to the face frame, and a plurality of hardware components releasably secured to the cross members, wherein the configurations allow for a plurality of hardware component configurations by allowing components of various sizes or shapes to be secured to the cross members. In the objection, the Examiner offers examples of the "plurality of cross members" as being the mounting/securing plates 62, 64 and the arm elements perpendicular to member 70, and indicates that the rollout tray 32 functions as the "face frame". The Examiner goes on to state that rotating mounting plate 64 by 180 degrees fulfills the requirement of a cross member being releasably securable in a plurality of cross member configurations. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's objection since claim 1, as amended, requires that the face frame define an interface area, that the cross member configurations divide the interface area into a plurality of sub-areas, and that the plurality of cross member configurations define various combinations of sub-areas within the interface area for receiving various hardware components. The "kiosk" disclosed by *Lewis et al.* does not meet these criteria since the rollout tray 32 does not define an interface area and the mounting/securing plates 62, 64 and arm elements perpendicular to member 70 do not define various cross member configurations that divide an interface area into a plurality of sub-areas. Firstly, simply rotating an element by 180 degrees does not create a different combination of sub-areas as it is merely a mirror image of the one previously defined. It is respectfully submitted that the extreme literal interpretation of the claims adopted

by the Examiner is not within the spirit of the invention, as the claims are to be read in the context of the specification which clearly establishes that the "plurality of cross member configurations" create different combinations of sub-areas. However, since *Lewis et al.* do not disclose all of the features of the kiosk as claimed in amended claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated thereby. With regard to claims 2, 4-8, 21 and 22, Applicant submits that these claims are not anticipated by *Lewis et al.* in light of their dependency upon claim 1. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 11, 15 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Damico et al.*, [U.S. Patent No. 4,104,710]. In the objection the Examiner states that *Damico et al.* disclose a kiosk comprising a cabinet, a face frame releasably securable to the cabinet, a plurality of cross members, at least one of the cross members being secured to the face frame, at least one of the cross members releasably securable in a plurality of cross member configurations in relation to the face frame, and a plurality of hardware components releasably secured to the cross members, wherein the configurations allow for a plurality of hardware component configurations by allowing components of various sizes or shapes to be secured to the cross members. Applicant respectfully traverses the objection for the reasons outlined below.

Damico et al. discloses a patient headwall unit for suspension on the headwall of a hospital room between two patient beds. The unit has a vertically elongated central section for accommodating electrical services and a vertically elongated lighting section fabricated integrally with and affixed to either side of the central section. The unit has been designed so as to meet the requirements of the needs of the medical staff and well as the patient. Based on the specification of the *Damico et al.* patent, it is clear that the lighting sections are specifically designed and constructed for their specific purpose and, therefore, do not offer any sort of flexibility with

regards to components of the lighting sections being releasably secured in various configurations to divide an interface area into different combinations of sub-areas. As for the central section of the headwall unit, different component areas are provided for the nurse call or communications box as well as for various gas mounts or outlets. While these component areas are defined by pairs of spaced-apart support rails, it is respectfully submitted that the support rails do not offer the flexibility provided by the cross members of Applicant's claimed kiosk. More specifically, while additional support rails may be added to the central section to accommodate additional gas outlets, the additional support rails merely add another area identical to the original gas mount area. The support rails disclosed by *Damico et al.* are not intended to the releasably secured in various different positions to create completely different combinations of component areas as is the case with Applicant's kiosk. When considering the *Damico et al.* reference, there appears to be only one appropriate position for each of the support rails and there is no suggestion by *Damico et al.* that these support rails can be re-positioned or completely re-oriented to create different combinations of sub-areas for different hardware components. Therefore, since amended claim 1 recites additional features that are not disclosed by *Damico et al.*, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated thereby. With regard to claim 11, this claim has also been amended in order to recite the additional feature of the cross members being releasably securable in a plurality of configurations so as to define various combinations of sub-areas within an interface area. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the arguments presented above are equally applicable to claim 11 and the claims that depend therefrom. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 11-13, 15, 23-25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Yee et al.*, [U.S. Patent No. 6,435,631]. In the objection the Examiner states that *Yee et al.* teach of an automated kiosk

comprising a cabinet, a face frame releasably securable to the cabinet, a plurality of cross members, at least one of the cross members secured to the face frame, at least one of the cross members releasably securable in a plurality of cross member configurations in relation to the face frame, and a plurality of hardware components releasably secured to the cross members, wherein the configurations allow for a plurality of hardware component configurations by allowing components of various sizes or shapes to be secured to the cross members. In the objection, the Examiner indicates that in his interpretation of the *Yee et al.* patent he considers the unit door (20) to be equivalent to the "face frame", and the bezel cover (14), breaker bezel (16, 116), first leg portion (140) of retaining tab (132), etc. to be equivalent to the "plurality of cross members" referred to in the present claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the random selection of elements suggested by the Examiner is in no way equivalent to the "plurality of cross members" referred to in the present claims. More specifically, both the bezel cover (14) and breaker bezel (16) function primarily as decorative trim and, therefore, are intended to conceal the openings between electrical components and the panel in which they are mounted. Therefore, the trim components referred to by the Examiner are not releasably securable in various configurations to divide a predetermined interface area into different combinations of sub-areas as they are merely used as trim for openings that are already defined in a panel. As for the leg portion (140) of retaining tab (132), this component serves to attach trim components to a panel and, as with the bezel cover and breaker bezel, does not divide a predetermined interface area into different combinations of sub-areas through various cross member configurations as is the case with the cross members referred to by Applicant. Furthermore, in the objection the Examiner takes the position that "various combinations of hardware components" as recited in the present claims, are achievable with the kiosk disclosed by *Yee et al.* since "it is viewed that the components may be interchangeable with similar model numbers". However, merely replacing one component with another component having a similar model number is not

equivalent to having a plurality of cross member configurations that allow for different combinations of sub-areas to be created within a defined interface area for receiving different types of hardware components.

Therefore, since *Yee et al.* do not disclose all of the features of Applicant's kiosk, as recited in amended claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated thereby. As mentioned above, claim 11 has also been amended to recite additional feature of the cross members being releasably securable in a plurality of configurations so as to define various combinations of sub-areas within an interface area. Therefore, the arguments presented above in connection with claim 1 are also applicable to claim 11. As for claims 2-3, 5, 6, 8, 12-13, 15, 23-25 and 28, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are not anticipated by *Yee et al.* by virtue of their dependence upon claim 1 or claim 11. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

35 USC 103

The Examiner has objected to claims 23-25, 27 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over *Lewis et al.* In the objection, the Examiner alleges that *Lewis et al.* teach Applicant's inventive claimed structure as disclosed above, including a faceplate (42), but does not show a plurality of faceplates or show various gaskets utilized for providing a seal between the faceplates and the cross members. As in the previous Office Action, the Examiner takes the position that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the assembly of *Lewis et al.* so as to employ more than one faceplate and sealing gaskets. Applicant submits that claims 23-25, 27 and 31 are both novel and inventive having regard to *Lewis et al* since, as set out above, amended claim 1 contains inventive elements over the *Lewis et al.* patent. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject response and amendment of claims is a complete response to all outstanding issues. Should the Examiner believe however that additional amendments to the claims may be required to secure allowance of this application; he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the above-noted number to facilitate further prosecution of this application.

Yours truly,

David J. Heller
DJH:VAT:jjp